

Remarks

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application, of which claims 8, 10, 18 and 20 have been withdrawn from consideration. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as allegedly failing to show every feature of the claimed invention. The undersigned respectfully disagrees. Figures 1-6 are believed to clearly illustrate and fully support the recitation of first and second contact elements configured to be joined in an electrically common manner. By way of example, Figure 4 illustrates the contact beams 116 and 118 to be integrally formed with one another through end walls 109 and 111 and center beam 112. Figure 5 illustrates the contact beams 166 and 168 to be integrally formed with one another via end walls 152 and 154 and center beam 156. Therefore, by the clear illustrations of Figures 4 and 5, the contact beams are electrically common with one another.

The embodiments of Figures 1-3 also support the claimed electrically common configuration. By way of example, paragraph 20 of the specification describes the contact elements 10 and 14 to include base portions that are soldered to a common pad or electrically joined traces on a circuit board. Paragraph 20 explains that the contact elements 10 and 14 are positioned on electrically common contact pads on the bottom surface of a processor. Thus, the claimed configuration is clearly supported by the drawings and the related text.

Moreover, it is believed that the drawings clearly support and illustrate contact elements that are configured to be joined to a circuit board. By way of example, paragraph 20 clearly states that the base portions 18 and 19 of the contact elements 10 and 14 are soldered to a common pad or electrically joined traces on a circuit board. This statement is only one example of how the illustrated contact elements may be configured to be joined to a common conductive path on the circuit board.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-17 and 19 have been objected to as allegedly being unclear regarding how the contact elements are configured to be joined in an electrically common manner and to be joined to a circuit board. It is believed that the above explanation of the drawings and specification, in connection with the claims, establishes that the language in

question is clear. Further, regarding the term “interleaved”, this term is used repeatedly throughout the specification in connection with the drawings and is believed quite clear. By way of example only, paragraph 24 describes the contact beams 34 and 38 to be overlapping in an interleaved manner. Paragraph 25 describes Figure 2 to illustrate a contact having contact elements 60 and 64 that face one another and are arranged in an overlapping interleaved manner. Paragraph 29 describes Figure 3 to include contact elements 80 to 84 arranged in an overlapping interleaved manner. This term is believed quite clearly illustrated.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12, 14-17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (USP 6,688,893) in view of Suzuki (USP 5,865,643). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for reasons set forth hereafter.

The patent to Huang issued from an application filed May 21, 2003, while the present application was filed July 22, 2003. Thus, Huang qualifies as prior art under 35 USC 102(e) and has a filing date only two months before the filing date of the present application. The inventors of the claimed subject matter of the present application conceived of the claimed invention before May 21, 2003 and were diligent in constructively reducing to practice the claimed invention by filing the present application on July 22, 2003. In support of these facts, a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 is submitted herewith, along with documents establishing the same. Therefore, Huang does not qualify as prior art against the claimed invention. The sole prior art rejection relies upon Huang as the primary reference and thus is overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dean D. Small, Registration No. 34,730
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070